

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

TONY HINES,

Plaintiff,

v.

B. FAULKNER,

Defendant.

Case No.: 2:19-cv-01203-GMN-EJY

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's Motions for Clarification and or a More Definite Statement (ECF No. 48) and for an Exact Clarification to Defendant(s) Responses to Plaintiff(s) Clarification Request (ECF No. 49). These Motions are in part duplicative. Each and together they seek assistance the Court cannot provide.

ECF No. 48 seeks "clarification" regarding ECF No. 45-1, Plaintiff's Motion for Interlocutory Appeal, and ECF No. 44, Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. ECF No. 49 appears to seek clarification of a series of documents produced in discovery, a letter sent by defense counsel to Plaintiff regarding "sealed medical exhibits," and on portions of Defendants' Summary Judgment Motion (ECF No. 33). *Id.* at 1-3. Plaintiff's clarification requests goes beyond that which the Court will assist any party, even a *pro se* inmate, as the Court is not counsel or otherwise an advocate for Plaintiff in this dispute. *See Bias v. Moynihan*, 508 F.3d 1212, 1219 (9th Cir. 2007) ("A district court lacks the power to act as a party's lawyer, even for *pro se* litigants."); *Pineda v. Hutchins*, Case No. 2:20-cv-02312-GMN-BNW, 2021 WL 3709231, at \*2 (D. Nev. Aug. 18, 2021) ("[d]istrict judges have no obligation to act as counsel or paralegal to *pro se* litigants.").

DATED this 11th day of May, 2022.

ELAYNA J. YOUGHAN  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE